No. 23. VOL. V.

# The Balance, AND COLUMBIAN REPOSITORY.

"HAIL SACRED POLITY, BY FREEDOM REAR'D!
"HAIL SACRED FREEDOM, WHEN BY LAW RESTRAIN'D!"

BEATTIE.

*HUDSON*, (NEW-YORK) *Tuesday*, JUNE 10, 1806.

## Original.

Hither the products of your closet-labors bring,
Enrich our columns, and instruct mankind.

### *FOR THE BALANCE.*

I AM extremely reluctant, Mr. Editor, to occupy, with remarks addreſſed to an individual, any portion of the Balance. I am reluctant to do this on two accounts. *Firſt*, Becauſe the Balance is managed for the purpoſe of diffuſing general information, upon ſubjects intereſting to the community at large. *Second*, Becauſe the individual I have to deal with, is known to few of the readers of the Balance. Since, however, he is nothing leſs than the Clintonian Hercules of New-Lebanon, I hope to be excuſed for introducing his giantſhip to the public.

To the writer of a late addreſs "to the independent electors of the County of Columbia," and of a ſubſequent addreſs "to Harry Croſwell," in which laſt, occaſion is taken, to pay ſome civilities "to his correſpondent LUCIUS."

*SIR*,

THE utter averſion, which you have again manifeſted, to incur the imaginary diſgrace of being deemed to dwell in obſcurity, induces me to make a ſecond effort to advance your celebrity. In order to facilitate the ſucceſs of this effort, I might here revert to your late publications above referred to, for the reputation of which we may eſtimate your ſolicitude, by the pains you have taken in the latter, not to ſpeak meanly of the former. But the peruſal of thoſe publications having been deſigned excluſively for the readers of the Pittsfield Sun, the object of recurring to them, is not fully attainable in the Balance. And why was that peruſal confined to thoſe readers? Wherefore, Sir, did you chooſe to carry your curioſities to a foreign market? Were they not ſaleable at home, where their value was beſt known? I do not find much to admire, Sir, in this policy of conferring on the Pittsfield printer, in preference to an equally reputable printer of your own county, the extra job of publiſhing your productions. The luſtre, it is true, of *ſuch* productions, may be moſt conſpicuous, when ſeen amidſt the blaze of *ſuch* a luminary. But though Mr. Holt could not furniſh all the advantages, which Mr. Allen poſſeſſed, he was, perhaps the more needy editor, and charity ſhould have decided in behalf of indigence. Beſides, had you choſen to patronize a ſinking eſtabliſhment, which, like a perſon drowning, graſps, promiſcuously, at whatever tide or chance may drive within its reach; you might, poſſibly, have avoided the humiliation, of beholding all your elaborate babble about "argument," and what you *innocently* call "ſound reaſoning," deſtined to decorate the tail end of a dirty newſpaper. For ſo tenacious is editor Holt reported to be, of ſubſiſting by his honeſt trade, that he would not refuſe the beſt inch of his Bee's broad ſurface, even to the paltry ballads of a begger.

As to your electioneering addreſs, ſir, over which you have watched with ſuch parental care, I am willing ſo far to ſhape my expreſſions to the gratification of your vanity, as to ſay, it may be leſs exceptionable, in ſome reſpects, than you ſeem to ſuſpect me of having imagined. But with regard to its political features, it is wholly deformed. It is, in this view, a mean miſrepreſentation of facts; if not, ſir, of facts which you well knew to exiſt.—Truſting, however, that a gentleman may be noticed, without being *much* noticed; and you not having ſpecified the preciſe quantity of notice you would like; I ſhall not tarry to examine, particularly, wherein you have diſfigured and diſguiſed political truth. Detection becomes unneceſſary, when the purpoſes of falſhood are defeated, by a diſcovery of the medium, through which it has been promulgated. Moreover, as the election is paſt, and the people have ſeen fit to differ with you, in reſpect to the eligibility of the candidates in whoſe inteſeſt you employed your influence, it would be invidious now to indulge in criticiſms, and compariſons, to which an examination of your performance, in a political light, would neceſſarily lead.

But the *ſtyle* of your addreſs, has, it ſeems, been admired: by a critic, too, of taſte: doubtleſs, a very candid, as well as competent judge: and you, forſooth, have, very modeſtly, as well as courteouſly, acquieſced in the deciſion. How the obliging verdict, which he paſſed, muſt have vibrated in the refined ears of a loggerhead, will probably never be known, but to you and your friend. He, perhaps, is the only one, who can feel, with you, thoſe ſublime ſympathies, which are awaked by a ſtipulated interchange of cheap commendations. But as it would be impoſſible to enlarge upon a theme ſo wretched, without appearing to trifle, I will not conteſt, with your friend, the propriety of his *lumping* admiration of your performance. I ſhould not, perhaps, have dwelt on ſuch a theme ſo long. I am aware, how unpleaſant it muſt be to moſt readers. But when I ſee a raw, unfledged writer, carried away with the abſurd whim, that, while he rivals Ariſtotle himſelf, in ſubtil intenſity of thought, he is, at the ſame time, a Terence, or a Sophocles, for the ſweetneſs of his diction; I am not only diſpoſed to ſay to that writer, "*Parce, puer, et fortius utere loris*;" I would even put a hand to the reins, and check him in his vain career. This, ſir, is the reaſon, why, on a former occaſion, I was willing to beſtow ſome ſtrictures upon your addreſs, which were deemed "unſeaſonable;" or, as you chooſe to have it, "unreaſonable;" and why, at preſent, I have conſented, no leſs unſeaſonably, to proceed ſo far in my obſervations. Had I felt ambitious of imitating your decency of ſpeech, *I might have preferred my remarks, with an avowal of my intention, not* to "anſwer a fool according to his folly." But I had no ſuch ambition. Nor ſhould I think it extremely decorous, directly to pronounce any gentleman a fool. Beſides, ſir, you have become an author, and it remains to commiſerate, not to divulge, your misfortune.

LUCIUS.

## Selected.

FROM THE NEW-YORK SPECTATOR.

### CONTRAST.

IT is not forgotten, that, in March laſt, (During a perplexing and gloomy period of our mercantile affairs) the merchants of this city tranſmitted a reſpectful letter to the Secretary of State, requeſting information on ſubjects of the higheſt importance to the commercial, agricultural and mechanical intereſts of our country. The merchants expected, and ought to have received a direct and explicit anſwer—one which ſhould have explained our foreign relations ſo far as was neceſſary, to guard our citizens againſt unuſual hazards, and to point out a ſecure path to mercantile enterprize. Inſtead of this, the anſwer, like moſt of the public documents or papers of our preſent executive, was unneceſſarily cautious, obſcure and unſatiſ-

factory.—Some of the moſt important topics of the letter were not noticed at all, and on none was any intomation given by the Adminiſtration of our *free* government, from which the deſired and uſeful deductions could have ſafely been drawn. —Now mark the contraſt.

In the ſame month of March, the merchants of Pruſſia, fearing a rupture with England, applied to the Miniſter for information reſpecting the commercial concerns of their country. What was the anſwer received by the Pruſſian Merchants from the Miniſter of their *monarchical* and *deſpotic* government?—Was it, like the anſwer of our *Republican* government to the Merchants of New-York, indefinite and evaſive? Was it, like that, calculated to increaſe the already augmented gloom of their commercial horizon? Was it, like that, given in ſuch cautious and obſcure terms, as to involve the anxious and perplexed citizen, in ſtill deeper ſolicitude and perplexity? Inſtead of this, it was, as the anſwer of the American Miniſter *ought to have been*, candid, explicit and ſatisfactory.—It ſtated in prompt and decided language, that there then exiſted no ſufficient ground to apprehend any hoſtile treatment of the navigation, and the property of Pruſſian ſubjects; and that his Pruſſian Majeſty had given his ſpecial command, that, ſhould any change occur in the commercial relations of the country, the Merchants ſhould receive *immediate information of the fact*. In this anſwer, we find no evaſions of the propoſed queſtions, no reluctance to give the ſolicited information.—The Pruſſian Merchants were not told, as the American Merchants were, that "a communication of the features of the proſpect [of foreign occurrences] which, if not multiplied and varied with the multiplied variation incident to it, muſt itſelf become a ſource of miſcalculation." They were not told, as our merchants were, that ſuch a communication "would exceed the *duty* and *reſponſibility* of any government." They were not turned aſide with the play of words, and the ſport of involved and obſcure ſpeculations.

Whence this difference of treatment and of opinion in the two governments? Why are the citizens of the American Republic denied that information, which is cheerfully given to the ſubjects of a monarch?—The anſwer is at hand—the cauſe cannot be concealed.

In Pruſſia as in all the maritime nations of Europe, commerce is viewed as an object of primary importance to the welfare of the country. The neceſſary and inſeparable connection of commerce with agriculture and the mechanical arts is there diſcovered and felt. Hence commerce is protected; the rights and intereſts of individuals, embarked in mercantile enterprizes, are readily conſulted; and neceſſary information willingly and promptly communicated.

But in this country, where commerce is the only ſource of revenue, there unfortunately prevails in the government a deeply rooted prejudice againſt merchants and mercantile affairs. A line of demarcation appears to be drawn between the commercial and agricultural intereſts of the country. Hence internal taxes are repealed, and the tax on articles of commerce increaſed—hence defence is provided for the weſtern country, while our commmerce and commercial cities are unprotected—hence the executive in a profane and ludicrous ſenſe, pronounces the cultivators of the land, the choſen people of God—and hence the organ of his will employs column after column of ſtale and ſtupid ſophiſtry to prove that Merchants have no rights to be regarded; that they are a uſeleſs, profligate and dependant ſet of beings; that they are leſs deſerving, leſs reſpectable, and leſs entitled to protection and encouragement, than any other claſs of men in the community. In this brief view, then, we have diſcovered the real cauſe, why our *republican* citizens are denied information which is readily afforded to the ſubjects of *deſpotic* governments.

---

FROM THE N. Y. EVENING POST.

The following obſervations on the proceedings of our laſt Congreſs, particularly on Mr. Wright's Bill, are from the London Courier, of March 3.

GREAT-BRITAIN AND AMERICA.

THE principles upon which the bill for the incouragement of murder is founded (for no other name does the bill brought into the American Houſe of Repreſentatives, for the protection and indemnification of American ſeamen deſerve) ſeem to have been borrowed from ſome of the barbarous codes of thoſe ſavage tribes, with which the Americans are in the habit of trading, rather than from any laws by which the civilized world is governed. Had we heard that the meaſure had been determined upon by the Creek or Cherokee Indians, we might not perhaps have been ſurpriſed, though we ſhould ſtill have lamented that there ſhould yet live, any ſet of human beings ſo far removed from civilization as to have recourſe to ſo barbarous a ſyſtem. But that men converſant in the arts of civiliz-d life, living under a civilized government, and communicating and correſponding with poliſhed nations, ſhould ſuffer ſuch a bill to be propoſed, without marking it with their inſtant anger and abhorrence is a circumſtance which equally excites our ſurpriſe and indignation. It ſhould ſeem as if the framers of the bill had determined to ſhew how utterly regardleſs they were of the laws and uſages of nations. Granted, for the ſake of argument, that the remonſtrances and reclamation of the Americans upon the ſubject of the injuries to their trade and impreſſed ſeamen, had been utterly diſregarded by us, what was the courſe which the law of nations pointed out to them to purſue? Either to declare war at once, or to adopt ſome of thoſe methods which, without going the length of poſitive war, are calculated to obtain ſatisfaction, for injuries or wrongs.——They might have adopted the law of retaliation, and detained our ſeamen and our property in their ports—they might have declared that they would apply the law of retortion, and would treat the ſubjects of Great-Britain, in the ſame manner, as the citizens of the U. States were treated, or they might have had recourſe to repriſals.

All theſe methods would have been juſtifiable by the laws of nations, ſuppoſing their claims to have been well founded. But none of theſe manly meaſures ſeem to be recommended or hinted at. A meaſure of cowardice & cruelty is ſuggeſted, which opens the door to the greateſt exceſſes, makes every man the judge in his own cauſe, and which is ſo worded, whether deſignedly or not we know not, as to apply to the ſeamen and ſubjects not only of America, but of any and every nation in the world. Let our readers conſider the difficulty in the firſt inſtance of diſtinguiſhing between American and Britiſh ſeamen. This difficulty cannot exiſt between any other two nations. A French ſeamen, a Spaniſh, a Dutch, a Ruſſian, or Swede, may be eaſily known from the ſeamen of other nations, becauſe their language is different. But in this caſe the language of the two countries is the ſame, their habits and manners. It may be ſaid, that the American ſeamen have certificated to prove that they are American citizens.—But is it not poſſible to procure thoſe certificates without being American citizens? Every one knows how anxious every power is to induce Britiſh ſeamen to enter into their ſervice. Our officers are fully aware of this; have they never found men, known to be Britiſh ſeamen with theſe certificates?—and muſt not that naturally make them ſuſpicious and diſtruſtful in all caſes?—Has not our government a right to be ſuſpicious itſelf upon the ſubject of theſe complaints, when they hear, as was ſaid in one of the papers, that among the perſons complained of as being impreſſed, are men known to have come from the North of Ireland, and to be ſubjects of his Britannic majeſty? Beſides, the manner in which perſons may acquire the rights and character of American citizens, is one which it cannot be expected our government will acquieſce in or acknowledge. Two years reſidence, it is ſaid, in America, or even on board a ſhip ſubject to American laws, gives a man a right to be conſidered as an American citizen. A Britiſh ſeaman may go to America, reſide there two years, and then enter on board an American ſhip, or he may in the firſt inſtance, enter on board an American ſhip, and remain there two years—are we to be reſtricted from impreſſing or claiming that man, becauſe he has obtained the privileges of an American citizen?—Can we acquieſce in a meaſure which goes

the length of making us accede to the principle, that a British subject can throw off his allegiance? If the American government do not or cannot prevent certificate from being fraudulently obtained by persons not American seamen, they have no right to complain of the little regard paid to any man in possession of such certificates. Let them prevent those certificates from being procured or possessed by any but American seamen, and they will have little cause, we have no doubt to complain of our conduct.

With respect to our restrictions upon the American trade, we are not sufficiently acquainted with the subject to be able to give any very decisive opinion; but they who during a period of war between other powers, carry on trade in a new and extraordinray way, cannot be surprized if we, who are one of those powers at war, apply new regulations. But the complaint of the manner in which the Americans carry on their commerce is not confined to Great Britain; it is urged equally by all the belligerent powers, and it is not a little curious that at the very time the congress were discussing the alledged impropriety of *our* conduct, they were receiving a Message containing complaints from France of the impropriety of *their own*. But the key and clue to all this violation and invective against this country can be furnished in five words. We will not countenance nor permit those illicit proceedings which have lately been adopted by American ships. Hence the rage and indignation against us for stopping at once those sources of large but illegal profits.—This is the "head and front of our offending." In all the petitions of the American merchants; in all the invectives of the American representatives; in the message of the President, the violation of the personal liberty of the citizen is treated as a secondary object: the restrictions upon the American trade are the grand and important grievance. The Americans hoped, and in this they were encouraged by official speeches and messages, that they should always be able to turn European war to their own exclusive profit; they thought that we should acquiesce in that principle, by which they might convey the produce of the colonies of the enemy to the mother country of such colonies, without molestation or interruption from us, provided they first imported it into their own country, landing it, and then reshipped and re-exported it to the mother country. They conceived that we should deem that sufficient to render the trade perfectly legal. Let our readers see to what lengths that would extend: We should be deprived of all chance of doing injury to the enemy by preventing or interrupting his trade with his colonies, and receiving the produce of those colonies, or sending to those colonies the produce of the mother country; a regular traffic would be carried on between the colonies and mother country by American ships; and that traffic would be rendered perfectly safe and secure by the mere circumstance of those ships touching for a day at one of their own ports, landing the goods one hour, paying the duties upon them, and re-shipping and re-exporting them the next. Is it not a mockery to call this a sufficient breaking the continuity of a voyage, and a sufficient importation to legalize a trade, which, had it been carried on direct from the colony to the mother country, would have been illegal? Great stress appears to be laid by the American merchants upon the circumstance of the goods being landed in an American port, and the duties paid before they re-shipped and re-exported; but what benefit or additional security do we derive from that circumstance? and, if we did, how are we to ascertain that that landing and payment have taken place?

The authors of these violent proceedings and language are still evidently afraid to go to war with us, They will not advise war, but they recommend a bill which, under the pretence of protecting and indemnifying American seamen, encourages assassination and legalizes murder. But do they not see that the passage of such a bill would be considered by us a declaration of war? As to any measure which could be adopted against this country, it will not be difficult to prove that they would be more injurious to the Americans than to us. Will they have recourse to the measure of non-intercourse with us? Do they imagine that that would be productive of material injury to us? Would it ruin our manufactures, or starve our West India colonies? We were at war with America for seven years, yet our manufactures were neither ruined nor our West India possessions starved.

Non-intercourse would be productive of the greatest injury to the Americans—their produce would find its way to neutral islands, from whence it would be carried to British islands and, the British manufactures, and the productions of the islands, would find their way to America by the same means. The effect would be as operating on the islands, that American produce would reach them at an encreased price. American produce would depend for its value on the enterprize of foreigners, the freights on American productions would be transferred to others, and the industry and enterprize of American merchants would be suspended.

Will they have recourse to the measure of sequestration? The effect of that measure would be very different now from what it would have been years ago. In the first place it is to be supposed that Great-Britain would retaliate. The American merchant formerly depended upon British capitals—a sequestration of debts would then have been a measure operating against Great-Britain only. But the Americans have since become opulent, and though they still derive great *facilities* from British capitals, yet those facilities cannot be considered as debts: for they are made upon property placed under the immediate orders, and subject to the control of the British merchant. The partisans of the principle of sequestration would do well to calculate the amount of property which is daily passing to Europe, under those circumstances, and then to consider what would be the result if Great-Britain were to retaliate.

The result would be, that the property would fall into the hands of the British merchant, and the facilities be denied, or in mercantile language, the bills drawn upon the property would be returned. We think that every man must perceive the evident distinction between advances made on property, and debts contracted upon the personal responsibility of the debtor; it is chiefly in the former way that the citizens of the United States are aided by British capitals.

Extensive credits for goods imported directly from Britain are not so common as heretofore, and it is not unusual for the dry goods merchants to remit for the half and sometimes for the whole of his goods before they are shipped. Those who are independent, find their accounts in this mode, as the very large discounts which they have allowed for prompt payment form a handsome profit.

Again, from the great increase of the capital in the United States, and from Britain being at war and they at peace, the Americans have at all times in British ports, and on their way to them many hundred sail of vessels, all of which would be lost. They have besides at all times an immense property afloat and unprotected in the East and West-Indies, and in Europe, one third or the half of which would be lost.

Will the Americans have recourse to an *embargo* upon all British ships in American ports? The advisers of such a measure would do well to refer to the experience of 1794, when such a measure was adopted. The persons most anxious at that time to have the embargo taken off, were those who had been the most violent against Great-Britain—they were the first to sink under the operation of a measure directed against Great-Britain.

But the promoters of these violent invectives and measures against this country, bear, we trust, but a very insignificant proportion to the mass of the people of the United States, who, we trust and believe, are influenced by wiser and sobeter ideas. The disputes between the two countries may yet, we hope, be adjusted, without compromitting the honor or the rights of either country.

## To Readers.

A number of articles prepared for the Closet omitted this week for want of room.

# Political.

FROM THE REPERTORY.

## SEQUEL OF A CORRESPONDENCE, &c.

[CONCLUDED.]

Thoſe ſentiments of the chief Magiſtrate, and of a man, too, whoſe abilities and virtues are ſo univerſally admired, are that "he conſiders the general principle on which the queſtion turns, as ſupporting the claims of the American underwriters to the benefit of the convention, when they have paid the loſs of the original owners, Citizens of the United States."

This opinion, Sir, we take pointedly to apply to the caſe of of the New-Jerſey, for which the Secretary of State's letter was ſpecially intended; and, indeed, the opinion muſt obtain whether the whole or part only of the underwriters have paid the riſk they had inſured; for in caſe they have, they muſt, according to the rules of juſtice and to the Preſident's opinion, recover what they had paid; and in caſe they have not, the inſured have preſerved their title to their property, to a full reſtitution to which General Hedouville has pledged the French loyalty; a reſtitution which the Council of Prizes have directed, and which the American board have ſanctioned.

We may now be permitted to inquire *what your excellency's objections have been to the effecting of the full reſtitution alluded to.* You have given it as your opinion that the underwriters had not an equal right with the inſured; and after altering your mind upon the ſubject, after writing us on the 21ſt of January, that you tranſmitted us your declaration reſpecting the neutralſhip of the veſſel and cargo, that "we might avail ourſelves of it, in the further proſecution of our claims as agents of M. M. Nicklin and Griffith and the various inſurance companies whom we repreſented," you again reſumed your former opinion, and in ſo unfortunate a manner, that the French government, whoſe only wiſh could be to fulfil a ſacred covenant, and to effect a reſtitution which the council of prizes had decreed and which was by the American board declared to be fully embraced by the convention, appear to have yielded to your opinion that *eight elevenths* of the claim ought to be rejected, taking at the ſame time a receipt, the conſequence of which ſeems to be that you alone, or your government, become anſwerable for the deficiency.

We can ſee no motive for ſuch an objection on your part, but your opinion aforeſaid that the underwriters are not entitled to the ſame reſtitution with the inſured, a point reſpecting which you are now officially informed, by the Secretary of State, that the Preſident thinks otherwiſe and that his *ſentiments* are in favor of the underwriters.

It cannot be ſuppoſed that you ſtill entertain any doubts about the New-Jerſey's owner's title as American citizens, ſince by your ſaid letter of January 21ſt you informed us that "the policies of inſurance and other documents which we had ſubmitted to your inſpection at different times, had entirely removed any doubts you might have had with reſpect to the fact that the ſhip New-Jerſey and her cargo were American property."

The miſrepreſentations that had been made upon the ſubject, and the effect it had with you, were the more to be deprecated as the whole of the owners are perſons moſt advantageouſly known in America, the lady of one of whom (Mrs. Griffith) has the honor of being related to you.

It is then a well aſcertained fact that the whole of the claimants are American citizens; and had not this been the caſe, they would not have repeatedly been declared to be entitled to the benefit of the conventions of 1800 and 1803.

Had their title as American citizens been queſtioned, the New-Jerſey would not have been reſtored them by the Council of prizes, the American commiſſioners would not have declared them to be entitled to the Louiſiana money, nor would your Excellency have agreed to the reſtitution even of *three elevenths* of their indiſputable claim.

But the point of the citizenſhip being once granted, the conſequence muſt be that *eight elevenths* of the claim were rejected merely becauſe you conſidered this portion of the claim as belonging to the Underwriters, and becauſe your opinion was that ſaid Underwriters were entitled to no redreſs or reſtitution whatſoever.

But this is the very point to which M. Madiſon's letter relates: he officially informs you that the Preſident entertains a different opinion upon the ſubject, and that he looks upon the underwriters as ſtanding exactly upon the ſame footing with the inſured.

Hence we may infer that, far from being foreign to our claim, M. Madiſon's letter was excluſively intended for the ſame, ſince it contains the Preſident's ſenſe reſpecting the only point, a wrong conſtruction of which has been the cauſe of denving *eight elevenths* of the amount.

Hence we may infer alſo that the only objection you may poſſibly have had againſt the claim, being ſo well explained and done away by the letter, the Preſident's wiſh muſt implicitly be underſtood to be that a full reſtitution be effected.

Said inference muſt be right indeed, unleſs your Excellency had other motives for thus rejecting ſo large a part of this claim, which we cannot ſuppoſe to be the caſe: 1ſt. becauſe we can ſee of no other pretence for rejecting the claim; 2d. becauſe Your Excellency's wiſdom warrants us that you would not chiefly after you had been ſo groſsly impoſed upon, reſpecting the very material point of the citizenſhip, have either liſtened to or adopted new motives of excluſion, without fairly having the ſame diſcloſed to thoſe concerned.

No body better than Your Excellency, knows that the laws and manners of your country can admit of no arbitrary meaſures of no deciſion which is not ſupported by motives openly declared to the party concerned, and by which ſaid party might, in the dark, be denied the eight elevenths of a juſt and conſiderable claim: no body better than you knows that the American law has not veſted a Miniſter, nor any officer under the American conſtitution, with the right of denying any one the benefit of Treaty, to which, as being "the law of the land," all Americans are equally entitled.

The claimants in the caſe of the New-Jerſey, have then as a kind of birth-right to be informed whether any motive, beſides the one alluded to in M. Madiſon's letter, has become a bar to the full admitting of their claim.

If any ſuch exiſts, we ſolemnly engage to do it away alſo.

If there is none but the one alluded to it is the Preſident's will that the claim be admitted.

To the above we beg leave to add, as obſerved to us by his Excellency the French Miniſter, that the claim muſt either be good or bad, for the whole of it. Hence the unavoidable conſequence that the Claimants are unjuſtly wronged to the amount of 800,000 francs, in the firſt caſe, and that the American treaſury are wronged to the amount of 300,000 francs in the other caſe.

Such a precedent cannot ſtand upon the records of ſo pure and wiſe an Adminiſtration as the American one; and we truſt you will not heſitate in granting us the following our prayer, either to diſcloſe to us the true motives by which you have been guided; or, if no new motive has occurred, and the opinion reſpecting the underwriters has been the only ground upon which the claim has been reduced, that you will, this ground being now happily removed, obtain from the French Miniſter and Government, an additional allowance equal to what remains due to the claimants upon the Louiſianian Funds.

The perſonal regard which ſaid Miniſter juſtly entertains for Your Excellency, added to the reſponſibility which a refuſal on his part muſt attach to your Government and to yourſelf, induces us to hope that your demand will be readily complied with.

Whether there are funds ſufficient left, is more than it is in our power to ſay. But in caſe the ſame were wanting, we muſt, after doing every effort in our power to ſupport our conſtituents' right in this country, truſt the ſame to the juſtice of their own country and the authority of the American law.

We muſt conclude by obſerving freely how ſorry we have been to find it ſtated in your Secretaty's anſwer to us, that *the caſe is terminated.* We can in a few words convince your Excellency that *it is not.*

1ſt. When we have received the 300,000 francs and given our receipt accord-

ingly, to which said expression must allude, we did it merely because upon our declining it at first, the French Minister positively declared to us that, "should said sum be refused, we should have nothing at all."

2d. The powers we had from the claimants, were intended only for a fair and full restitution of the amount of the claim. Hence the inference that we had no authority to compromise or agree to so heavy and so unjust a sacrifice, and that, when compelled to do it, if we have received a partial payment only, the claimant's rights cannot in the least, be inpaired by it.

3d. A settlement of this kind can never be compared with the one made between individuals to the usual course of judicial proceedings. We admit that where two Parties being of age, after being at law, come to a compromise, said compromise must be a bar to their respective claims because every party had a right to support and defend his claim and to abide by the decision of the law.

But the case is quite the reverse in an *administrative settlement*, that is, a settlement between an individual claimant and Government. Governments, as being the source of justice, sit as judges in their own cause and their party is denied the privilege of debating or otherwise supporting his rights. Hence the necessary inference that an administrative settlement can never be said to *terminate a case*, unless the same be just and equal to the demand; because, as long as there is something unpaid, the claimant is, of right, supposed to have made a reservation of what he could not inforce an actual payment of, for which he must trust to the justice of his debtor, and for which he has a fair claim as soon as the indebted government perceive that they were mistaken, and that they have but partially done that justice which it was their wish and duty to do full and complete.

These rules are constantly practised by the French administration whose agents are sensible that from the very circumstance of their being judges in their own cause, no act of theirs can be set up as a bar against the creditor, as long as justice was not completely done.

As to the American Government, the same rule ought the more to prevail in this case, as their Representative, through errours, of which no man is exempt, and which said Government has officially disclaimed, has been the author of the enormous and unjust reduction which the claim has experienced.

We trust therefore that Your Excellency will not consider this as being a *terminated case*; that you will deem it right and proper to grant us our said request, viz. Either to have the balance of the claim discharged, or to state to us whether any and what motives, besides the one alluded to in M. Madison's letter, has and still does prevent the discharging the whole amount aforesaid.

Should Your Excellency refuse both these two points, we think it our duty to persist in the protestation we have already made, as well as those which the Claimants themselves have made both in their memorial to the Secretary of State of the 25th July last, and in their letter to you of the 9th of August.

With the highest regard, we have the honor to be, SIR,

*Your Excellency's, most obedient humble servants.*

J. M. DE LA GRANGE.
DU PONT."

---

Having laid before our readers this detail of the conduct of General ARMSTRONG, we presume comment is unnecessary. How mortifying is the fact, that the American Plenipotentiary should be thus publickly convicted of gross falshoods, in his official capacity, in a foreign country, and in the act of depriving his fellow citizens of their property! Messieurs *Du Pont* and *La Grange* have not given him the *lie* direct, but they have given the evidence of his falshoods to the world, by quoting the President's instructions, and the written declaration of the General, that those instructions *did not relate* to the case in question!!

From a view of the facts before us, we should presume that General Armstrong *must*, now, be recalled in disgrace. We cannot conceive that it can be avoided.—The circumstance of his second appointment, by our government, after the iniquity of this transaction with respect to the *New-Jersey* was known here, already excites suspicions as to the existence of a corrupt combination, which the further support of government, would confirm. The corrupt and fraudulent management of the funds, arising from the purchase of Louisiana, and the recent transmission of two millions more to the hands of General Armstrong, lead to the conclusion that there has been formed *a very lucrative copartnership*, of which the U. States is no party.

---

## *INTERESTING*
# Foreign Intelligence.

LONDON, APRIL 24.

### *Prussian Notification.*

Count Schulenbergh Kehnert published the following short, but important Declaration, at Hanover on the 28th ult.

"In a Treaty, concluded between His Majesty the King of Prussia, and his Imperial Majesty the Emperor of the French and King of Italy, it is determined, that the ports in the North Sea, and also the rivers running into the same, shall be shut against the British trade and navigation, *in the same manner as when the French troops were in possession of the territory of Hanover.*

"In consequence of the superior orders I have received, I hereby make this known to the public concerned, in order that they may secure themselves against any damage, as the troops of the King, my master, have received orders to repel and prevent the entrance of British ships into any of those ports and rivers and as convenient measures will be taken to hinder the entrance of and transmit of British wares.

Count SCHULENBERG KEHNERT."

---

### *State Paper.*
PRUSSIAN PATENT.

"We, Frederick William, King of Prussia, &c. &c. make known and declare as follows:

"The wish to secure to our faithful subjects, and the neighboring states of the North of Germany during the war, and to preserve and confirm the duration of the blessings of peace, was at all times the intention of our indefatigable endeavors. These wholesome measures, were made known upon some recent occasions, as the object of one late Patent, dated January 27, 1806; according to which the Electoral States of Brunswick, Lunenberg in Germany were taken possession of by our troops, when the administration of the same passed into our hands. But in consequence of the exchange of the electors of Hanover, in consideration of the cession of three of the provinces of our monarchy, and for the permanent tranquility of our subjects and the neighboring states, we have found it indespensably necessary to enter into and conclude a convention with his Majesty the Emperor of the French and King of Italy; and as the Electoral States of the House of Brunswick, situated in Germany, were obtained by the Emperor Napoleon by *right of conquest*, we hereby declare, that the *right of possession* of the territory of that House has passed over to us, in consideration of the cession of three of our provinces, and is now subject to our power only, consequently from the present time, the government and the administration of these countries will be administered simply in our name alone, and under our supreme authority.

"We therefore call upon all persons, whatever may have been the functions assigned them, to execute those functions only in our name, and under our authority.

"Count Schulenberg Kehnert, and the Commissioners who are attached to him, expect no less than that all the Prelates, the Burghers, and the inhabitants in general, will obediently conform themselves to the order of things, which a new æra has rendered necessary for their tranquility and well being; and in so doing, they will afford his Majesty a proof of their devotion to their country.

"So, on our part, nothing shall be neglected to confirm them in the persuasion of our paternal affection, and our sincere wish to render them happy.

(Signed) FREDERICK WILLIAM,
SCHULENBERG,
HAUGWITZ."

"*April* 1, 1806."

---

### *Important State Paper.*
DECLARATION.

GEORGE THE THIRD, by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great-Britain and Ireland, King, Defender of the Faith, Duke of Brunswick and Lunenbergh, Arch Treasurer and Elector of the Holy Roman Empire, &c. &c.

The Court of Prussia has avowed those hostile designs, which she thought to conceal by her friendly professions.

The *Note Verbale*, delivered on the 4th of April, by the Prussian Envoy, Baron Jacobi Kloest, to the British Ministry, announces that the Electorate of Hanover has been taken possession of, and that the ports of the German Sea, and of Lubeck, have been closed against the British flag

This Delaration gives the lie to all those assurances by which the Cabinet of Berlin has hitherto endeavored to cloak its proceedings, to which it moreover adds the pretension that his Prussian Majesty has acquired by his system of policy, claims to the gratitude of all the Northern Powers.

Thus actually dispossessed of the ancient inheritance of my family, and, insulted in my rights as a Sovereign, I have ordered those measures to be taken which the honor of my Crown requires; but I still owe it to myself, to Europe, and to my sub-

jects, to make a public declaration of my sentiments, as Elector of Brunswick Luneneberg, upon the unjust usurpation of my German possessions.

It is not necessary to prove how contrary this act is to the rights of nations, or to the laws of the German Empire. Their infraction is too evident to be required to be proved. It is the most sacred principle of good faith, of honor, in fact, of all the obligations upon which the reciprocal safety of different States among themselves, and of each civil society in itself, repose, which are trodden under foot in such a manner, that the world would have difficulty in believing it, if I did not cause the facts to be laid before them, which are authenticated in the narrative which I have ordered to be prepared.

The proceedings of the Court of Berlin when the Electorate was occupied by its troops in 1801; its conduct, far from being friendly during the negociation for the indemnities which followed the peace of Luneville; the declaration which it made, when France prepared to invade the Electorate; and lastly, he burthensome conditions under which it endeavored to cause it to be evacuated, to substitute her own troops, instead of France, had given too many proofs to the Government of Hanover, not to oblige it to endeavor to avoid all sort of intervention on the part of this Power, even at the moment that it was on the point of engaging in a dispute with France. The events which retarded the arrival in Hanover of the expedition, concerted between Great-Britain, Russia, and Sweden, gave the Prussian troops an opportunity of anticipating them, after the French army had been obliged to evacuate the Electorate.

This step was accompanied with the most friendly protestations on the par of Prussia She invited the Hanoverian Government to resume its functions in my name, and to collect the wreck of the army.

The country, already so unfortunate, doubly felt the weight of the numerous requisitions extorted by the Prussian corps, without the least regard to the situation in which the French left it.

After the unfortunate result of the campaign of *the allies in the south of the empire*, an attack in *the north* was to be expected. His Imperial Majesty of Russia, to obviate the dangers to which Prussia might be exposed, placed in consequence of the convention of Potzdam, his troops under Count De Tolstoy, and the corps of General Benningsen, under the orders of his Prussian Majesty, and promised him, moreover, all the assistance for which he might have occasion. It was scarcely to be expected that Prussia would avail herself of this advantage and of that which the promise of the subsidy she had asked of G Britain gave her, to obtain from France terms contrary to the interest which these resources were intended to protect. This, notwithstanding, has actually happened The secret treaty, the effects of which are beginning to appear, was signed by Count Haugwitz and the French general Duroc, the 12th of December, 1805, the period fixed as the term when Prussia was to declare war against France, in case that power should have rejected the propositions which Count Haugwitz was to make to her, in consequence of the Convention of Potzdam.

Seven days after, December 22, the Cabinet of Berlin proposed to the British ambassador the arrangements to be taken in common with the Prussian Generals for the propositions of the allied armies in Lower Saxony; and dispatched in consequence, Lieutenant Colonel Baron De Krusemark, with a letter to the Hanoverian Government, to induce it to furnish provisions for the French garrison at Hameln.

It was necessary to concur in this arrangement, (which was only provisionally terminated the 4th of January) because it was to prevent the French troops from undertaking any thing against Hanover during the negociation.

Was the court of Berlin then ignorant in what manner Count Haugwitz had concluded this negociation? Did it no know, before the signature of of the treaty, what would be the end of it? Or, did that Minister dispose, as he pleased, of the good faith of his master?

It was on the 27th of January, that the Cabinet of Berlin announced to the Hanoverian governments "that in consequence of a treaty signed and ratified by the two parties, my German possessions would no longer be occupied by the French troops; that they would be entirely evacuated by those who were still there, and delivered up, until a *future peace* between England and France should have decided their condition, to the protection of the troops of his Prussian Majesty, and to his exclusive administration." The Hanoverian Government was required, but to no purpose, to intimate to all the public officers, that they were for the future, to consider themselves, as finally responsible to the Prussian commissions of administration, excluding all *foreign reference*.

The dispatch addressed the 25th of last January to the Prussian Minister, and intended to justify this proceeding, was signed with the King of Prussia's own hand. It ended with these words—"I think it unnecessary to observe how much the territories in question ought to be satisfied with this change of scene; and my wishes would be fulfilled if, in consequence of the disinterested views by which I am impelled, the administration I have taken upon me should turn out to the happiness of the country and its inhabitants; and by that means *satisfactory* to his Britannic Majesty, to whom I desire nothing more than to give, in *this instance, as in all others*, all the proofs of consideration, of deference, and of friendship, which circumstances may put in my power."

The experience of the past, and a well-founded apprehension of the future, did not allow me to hesitate about the part necessary to be taken; and my Electoral Government was instructed not to enter into any negociation, the object of which might have been to avoid a new French invasion, by allowing the Prussians to occupy Hanover.

The protest made upon this occasion by my Electoral minister of state was ineffectual. The King of Prussia caused the greatest part of the country to be occupied at the moment that my troops re-embarked; and his measures were executed without the least regard.

It was too easy to foresee that Count Haugwitz would find means at Paris to bring back the arrangement between Prussia and France, *announced here as ratified by the contracting parties*, to its original intention.

This was what took place; and the French troops took possession of Anspach, one of the objects of compensation, according to the treaty of December 15, the very day that the Marquis de Lucchesini could reach Berlin with intelligence that France required the execution of the articles agreed upon at Vienna.

The answer returned by the British Cabinet to the communication of January 25, did not arrive at Berlin until after the minister of State, Baron Hardenberg, had announced to the British Envoy the hostile measures which have compelled me to suspend my relations with a court which could so far forget itself.

The Prussian note of April 4 can furnish no good arguments to establish an unjustifiable measure.

It begins by vaunting the pacific disposition of Prussia. This disposition is no further sincere than as it has for its foundation the principles of a just neutrality. The note delivered by the cabinet of Berlin to the French minister on the 14th of October, at the very instant that Prussia appeared to feel the affront which she received by the violation of the territory of Anspach, acknowledges that the conduct which she had followed to that time had proved of advantage to France.

Her actions had much less pretensions to the character of impartiality. After having permitted the French troops who seized on the Electorate of Hanover a passage through the Prussian territory, she declared herself ready to oppose, sword in hand, that which the Emperor of Russia had demanded for his armies.

France herself forced the passage: she pretended to offer excuses for that step, but it was in a manner equally offensive.

She had seen too clearly where the resentment of Prussia would terminate, which in fact appeared to be stifled when his imperial Majesty of Russia engaged in a personal communication with the King.

Prussia then demanded subsidies of Great Britain, which were promised to her, and she signed the convention of Potsdam, *the conditions of which she would doubtless have been more disposed to fulfil, if I could have so far forgotten my duty, as to consent to the proposition of ceding the electorate of Hanover for some Prussian Province*

Prussia affirms, that from the events of the war, she has not had the choice of means to secure the safety of, its monarchy, and of the states of the North. She wishes to make it appear, that she has been compelled to aggrandize herself, and to become the instrument, rather than the object, of the vengeance of my enemies.

Such an avowal does not become a great Power. All Europe knows that it depended on Prussia, before the battle of Austerlitz, to give repose to Europe, if she had taken the part which her real interests and the outraged honor of her monarchy dictated to her. She can no longer be excused, after having missed such an opportunity; and even since the event of the 2d of December, did she not command an army of 250,000 men, who still remember the victories it obtained under the Great Frederick, which was in the best disposition, and supported by the whole Russian army, two corps of which were actually under the command of the King of Prussia.

She would, without doubt, have been subject to certain risks; but she found herself in a situation, when every danger must be encountered to save the honour of the state. The Prince who hesitates in making a choice destroys the principle which serves as the basis of a military monarchy; and Prussia ought already to begin to feel the sacrifice she has made of her independence.

The Note of April 4, affirms, 'that France had considered the Electorate as its conquest, and that its troops had been on the point of re-entering it, to make a definitive disposal of it.'

The electorate of Hanover, as an integral part of the Germanic Empire, is not concerned in the war between Great-Britain and France; nevertheless, it has been unjustly invaded by that Power, which has, notwithstanding, frequently indicated the object for which she was disposed to restore it.

France was at last compelled to abandon the country, and forty thousand of my troops, and those of my allies, were established there, when the Count De Haugwitz signed the treaty which disposes of my states It is true, that the Russian corps was then at the disposal of his Prussian Majesty; but its chief, with the genuine spirit of an honorable man, was not the less determined to fight, if the allies of his master were attacked. We shall not speak of the French garrison which remained at Hameln, insufficient in point of number, deprived of the means of defence, and on the point of being besieged, when the promises of Prussia caused the plan to be abandoned.

The intention of France to dispose definitively of the Electorate would have been contrary to the assertion she has so often made. It would, moreover, have been contrary to the usage of war, since even a conquest is not definitively disposed of before a peace; and particularly at a moment when a wish might exist to manifest a pacific disposition.

Prussia had no right to judge if G Britain had the means of opposing the return of my enemies to the Electorate. Her power furnishes her with the means of bringing the war to an honourable end, for the interests she defends; but it is difficult to conceive in what light Prussia pretends that her measures removed troops that are *strangers* to the Electorate, and ensures the repose of the North Her troops, in consequence of the treacherous conduct of her cabinet, will remain as much strangers to the Electorate as the French troops

Prussia should not speak of her sacrifices at the moment when her only aim is to aggrandize herself, unless she feels the loss of her independence to be such, and how much she has departed from her duty in abandoning one of the oldest possessions of her house, and of subjects who implored, in vain, her assistance. Besides, sacrifices have no connection with my system of policy, and confer no right on her to usurp the government of my German subjects, whose fidelity in thing has hitherto shaken, and which they will retain towards my person, and a family of princes, who for many ages have only sought their happiness.

It is evident that the conduct of the court of Berlin is not the free expression of the will of its sovereign, but the consequence of the influence exercised by my enemies in the cabinet of that prince All the courts and all the states, however, who can judge of circumstances, and all that the owe to the system adopted by the court of Berlin, will agree that the act committed against a sovereign united to his Prussian Majesty by the ties of blood, and until now by those of friendship, places the safety of Europe in greater dan-

ger than any act of hostility on the part of a power with which one might be at open war.

Convinced of the justice of my cause, I make my appeal to all the powers of Europe, who are interested in resisting the consolidation of a system which, by threatening the political existence of an integral part of the German Empire, brings into question the security of the whole. I demand, most earnestly, the constitutional aid which is due to me as an elector, from the empire its august head, as well as Russia and Sweden, the powers have guaranteed its constitution, and still continue to manifest, the most honourable disposition for the preservation of my states.

Lastly, I protest in the most solemn manner, for myself, and my heirs, against every encroachment on my rights in the Electorate of Brunswick Luneburgh, and its dependencies; and I repeat, in quality of elector the declaration made by the minister of my crown at the court of Berlin, that no advantage arising from political arrangements, much less any offer whatever of an indemnity, or equivalent, shall ever engage me to forget what I owe to my dignity, the attachment, and exemplary fidelity of my Hanoverian subjects, so as to yield my consent to the alienation of my electorate.

Given at the Palace of Windsor, the 29th day of April, 1806, in the 46th year of my reign.

(L. S.) GEORGE R.

E. Count De Munster.

# Hudson, *June* 10.

Be it our weekly task,
To note the passing tidings of the times.

.....

*Extract of a letter from Halifax dated the 14th of May* 1806.

"There are five Americans here under adjudication, all detained by Capt. Whitby of the Leander, who swears he will have them all libelled, as well as all he takes. And as he is going to sea again on Monday, to cruize, as I understand off the Hook, the probability is he will capture many more. His conduct is truly astonishing, and his treatment to American captains in every instance is abusive. He is void of all shame; is universally detested here; and it is expected will be ordered home immediately, on his recent conduct being represented to his Government, and probably be deprived of his commission. It is thought he will distress and abuse every American he meets with on his next cruize, which he may suppose (and which we fervently hope) will be his last."

[*Mer. Adv*]

Norfolk, May 19.

*The French admiral Linois taken.*

Saturday arrived in Hampton roads his Britannic Majesty's frigate Tartar, Captain Hawker, from Bermuda. Three days since boarded the American ship Hunter from Lisbon bound to Alexandria. On the 15th April in lat. 25, long 33, the Hunter was boarded by H. M. brig Raven, from the squadron, under the command of Sir John Borlase Warren, then in sight, with the French ship Marengo, Admiral Linois, of 84 guns, and the frigate Belle Poule of 40 guns, captured by Sir John, on their passage from India for France, about the middle of March. The squadron consisted of 15 sail, including the two captured ships.

Linois was returning, laden with the spoils of a three years successful cruize. The Hunter went up the bay yesterday.

[In addition to the above, it may not be amiss to notice the following article, which we find in a Liverpool paper of the 7th ult.—

"Arrived at Kinsale on the 29th ult. the Hambro's ship John Parish, from the river Plata, bound to London—was boarded on the 7th ult. by the Marengo man of war Admiral Linois, in company, with a frigate, and suffered to proceed immediately. The captain of the John Parish kept sight of them till the 11th. The Marengo was in a very shattered condition"]

FROM THE ALBANY GAZETTE.

## *NEW-YORK STATE ELECTION.*

1806.

### *Members of Congress.*

Samuel Riker, for the counties of Suffolk and Queens.

Gurdon S. Mumford and George Clinton, jun for the city of New-York and counties of Kings and Richmond.

Philip Van Cortlandt, for the counties of Westchester and Rockland.

John Blake, jun. for the county of Orange.

Daniel C. Verplanck, for the co. of Dutchess.

Barent Gardinier,* for the counties of Ulster and Greene.

James I. Van Alen,* for the county of Columbia.

Killian K. Van Rensselaer, for the county of Albany.

Josiah Masters, for the county of Rensselaer.

John Thompson,* for the counties of Saratoga, Clinton and Essex.

David Thomas, for the county of Washington.

Peter Swatt,* for the counties of Montgomery and Schoharie.

John Russel, for the county of Otsego and Delaware.

William Kirkpatrick,* for the counties of Herkimer, Oneida, Jefferson, Lewis and St. Lawrence.

Reuben Humphreys,* for the counties of Chenango, Madison, Onondago, Tioga and Broome

John Harris * for the counties of Cayuga, Seneca, Ontario, Genesee and Steuben.

Mr. Van Rensselaer and Mr. Gardinier, are federalists.—The other gentlemen are Lewisites and Clintonians—we cannot at present particularly designate them.

* New Members.

### *State Senators.*

Benjamin Coe and Jonathan Ward, for the *Southern District.*

James Burt and Elisha Barlow, for the *Middle District.*

Jacob Snell, for the *Eastern District.*

Jacob Gebhard, John Ballard, Nathan Smith and Salmon Buel, for the *Western District*

In the Western District, the Clintonian Senator Ticket has an average majority rising 300.

### *Members of Assembly.*

*Albany*—Daniel Hale, Joseph Shurtleff, Johan Jost Dietz, Asa Colvard, David Bogardus, Jacob Veeder.

*Rensselaer*—Asa Mann, Adam Yates, Gilbert Eddy, Robert Woodworth and William Reynolds.

*Washington*—James Hill, John Grey, Jason Kellogg, Kitchel Bishop, William Roberts, and Peleg Bragg.

*Saratoga*—Jesse Mott, David Rodgers, Gideon Goodrich, and Chauncey Belding.

*Schobarie*—Henry Shafer, and Peter Swart, jun.

*Montgomery*—Alexander Sheldon, James Lansing, William Van Olenda, Harmanus A. Vedder, and Lawrence Gross.

*Otsego*—Robert Roseboom, Gurdon Huntington, Thomas Brookes and Henry Scott.

*Herkimer*—George Widrig, Samuel Wright, and John Kennedy.

*Oneida*—Charles Z. Platt, Uri Doolittle, George Brayton.

*Onondaga*—Ozias Burr, and Squire Munro.

*Tioga and Broome*—John Miller.

*Columbia*—Anson Pratt, Elisha Gilbert, jun. Gaius Stebbins and Peter Sharp.

*Dutchess*—Martin E. Winchel, Theron Rudd, Tobias L. Stoutenburgh, Veniah Woolley, John Storm, John Haight, and Aaron Hazen.

*Greene*—Samuel Haight, and James Thompson.

*Delaware*—Joshua Pine, and John T. Moore.

*Ulster*—Peter P. Roosa, Jacob Marius Groen, Stephen Rea, and John Conklin.

*Orange*—Andrew Mcord, Abraham Shultz, John Wood, and William Crist.

*Westchester*—W. Barker, A Odel, B. Isaacs, and S. Marvin.

*New York*—Henry Rutgers, Samuel Russel, Arthur Smith, John Bingham, James Warner, William W. Gilbert, Benjamin Ferris, Clarkson Crolius, and Fr. Cooper.

*Richmond*—D. Mersereau.

*Kings*—John Hicks.

*Suffolk*—David Warner, David Hedges, and Israel Carll.

*Queens*—Stephen Carman, Henry O. Seaman, and William Mott.

*Chenango*—Obadiah German, and Joseph Simonds.

*Madison*—Sylvanus Smalle, and E. Cleveland.

*Seneca*—Cor. Humphrey.

*Clinton*—Nath. Platt.

*Essex*—Stephen Cuyler.

*Ontario and Genesee*—Alexander Ray, Philetus Swift, and Asahel Warner.

*Cayuga*—Amos Rathburn, and John Grower, jun.

*Jefferson and Lewis*—Moss Kent.

*Steuben*—John Wilson.

### *Political complexion of the Assembly.*

| | Federal. | Lewisite. | Clintonian. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Albany, | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Cayuga, | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Chenango, | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Clinton, | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Columbia, | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Delaware, | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Dutchess, | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Essex, | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Greene, | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Herkimer, | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Jefferson and Lewis, | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Kings, | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Madison, | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Montgomery, | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| New-York, | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Oneida, | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Onondaga, | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Orange, | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Ontario, | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Otsego, | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Queens, | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Rensselaer, | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Richmond, | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Rockland, | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Saratoga, | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Seneca, | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Schoharie, | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Steuben, | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Suffolk, | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Tioga and Broome, | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Ulster, | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Washington, | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| Westchester, | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | 18 | 39 | 43 |

Having perfected the above Statement as to counties, and made some few alterations from our former publications, we hesitate not to give it as our opinion, that it now stands substantially correct.

"To Ontario and Geneffee, we give three Clintonians, becauſe that ticket ſucceeded in full; but it is ſaid, and with probability, that one in Ontario will certainly be a friend to the preſent adminiſtration, and of the two there is ſome hope."

[*Ontario Freeman.*

It is confidently said, that in Rensselaer, there will be three if not four Lewisites; and that in Otsego there will be one or two—so it is said of Onondaga and Madison. It is also said there will be two Clintonians in Montgomery; though the democratic paper printed in that county says but *one*. The members elected in Washington, being all on the Clintonian Ticket, they are all claimed by that party; but our information induces us to believe that one if not two are Lewisites.

The awful sentence of death was on Saturday passed upon John Banks for the murder of his wife. Though delivered in that solemn and impressive manner for which the hon. Judge Tompkins is remarkable, and though it was a powerful appeal to the best feelings of the heart, the prisoner remained unmoved. He exhibited a shocking instance of human depravity; enquired of the court if he could not be hanged the week following; and shouted as if in a delirium of joy. The day of execution is fixed for Friday the 11th of July. [*Mer. Adv.*]

## Wreath.

### EXTRACT.

*To the Editor of the Evening Post.*

Sir,

The following is an humble attempt at a translation of the celebrated Elegy of Moschus on the death of Bion. I am sensible that in transplanting the odorous flowers of Asia into our ungenial soil, many a leaf has been despoiled of its luxuriance by the rude hand of an unskilful gardener. You will also observe, that much has been omitted. In fact, the original is so perfumed with the fragrance of Asiatic scents, that a modern reader would be in danger of dying "in aromatic pain" had the translation been more faithful. Our style will not bear the exuberance of the oriental diction.

ELEGY

*From the Greek of Moschus on the death of Bion.*

OH! all ye groves and gurgling waters moan,
And ye small streams, that gently roam,
Lend me your tears to weep o'er Bion's urn;
He's gone—and never will to us return.

Ye shrubs and plants distil your drops,
And lofty trees bow down your tops;
Ye flow'rs be cloth'd with sable weed,
And let your leaves with pity bleed.
Weep, weep, Anemone! and eke the rose,
Bewail with us our gloomy woes.

Sicilian muses, join the mournful cry,
And sing with me his plaintive elegy!

Ye nightingales that cheer the woody throng,
When on the breeze ye waft your tuneful song;
Tell all the nymphs that lightly lave,
In Arethusa's limpid wave,
That all our pleasing hours are fled,
Since Bion's numbered with the dead.

Sicilian muses, join the mournful cry,
And sing with me his plaintive elegy!

Strymonian swans, begin and sing,
And let his doleful dirges ring,
O'er all the shores, where oft his lyre
Sooth'd the soul or rapt to fire.
Such notes, Ægrian nymphs, as ye have heard,
When on your plains he fed his herd.

Sicilian muses, join the mournful cry,
And sing with me his plaintive elegy!

For to his flocks no more he plays,
No more he weaves his witching lays,
But under Pluto's gloomy power
His pipe beguiles the lazy hour,
His flocks in grief refuse to feed;
Another master tunes the reed!

Sicilian muses, join the mournful cry,
And sing with me his plaintive elegy!

Phœbus, and all the Sylvan crew,
For him their ceaseless sorrow shew,
Pan hears no more his wonted lays,
When through his groves he fondly strays:
"To pleasure now adieu!" he loudly cries,
And echo, list'ning sad, "adieu!" replies.

Sicilian muses, join the mournful cry,
And sing with me his plaintive elegy!

So too the drooping Naiads mourn,
Their tears bedew his hallow'd urn;
They weep, that now no more they'll hear,
His cadence melting on the ear;
Their frolic games they lay aside,
Since they have lost their chiefest pride.

Sicilian muses, join the mournful cry,
And sing with me his plaintive elegy!

SEDLEY.

### EPIGRAM.

When we've nothing to dread from the law's sternest frowns,
How we laugh at the Barrister's wigs, bags, and gowns!
But no sooner we want them to sue or defend,
Than their laughter begins, and our mirth's at an end.

## Monitorial.

To aid the cause of virtue and religion.

.....

*Extract from the* Miscellaneous Companion, by William Matthews.

### MAXIMS AND THOUGHTS.

Among the numerous objects that strongly attach us to this world, and make us look with reluctance towards another, perhaps none is more strong, because none more fully absorbent of the mental powers, than the love of Learning.

The love of many other things becomes gradually weakened by the lessening of the powers of enjoyment. The love of money, perhaps, may be as strong as that of literature, if not more so—and as constant a companion to the grave. But literature, to persons of fine taste and judgment, has charms superior to almost every other subject: and, perhaps, in proportion as activity becomes irksome to studious persons, the love of tranquility or silent conversation, becomes naturally more grateful.

Neither are we to wonder at the proofs which learned men sometimes give, of strong reluctance to quitting this world. They may have as strong a belief as the more illiterate, in the doctrine of a future state, and the happiness of immortality. And they may feel, as powerfully, the mortifications attendant on this state of being. But having been accustomed to place their affections on those things, which to them have been the means of wisdom, and a brilliant species of entertainment—the perpetual feast of sober reason, instead of the gratification of disorderly passions; such men are less affected by the decay of the body, because the mind remains clear and vigorous.

Add to this, that whatever men have been long accustomed to dwell upon with delight, must necessarily appear a matter of durable importance to them: the improvement of letters and philosophy, which a regular student has delighted to consider as a good, he has generally been accustomed to pursue with *fondness*, and progressive *admiration*.

Those improvements become objects of a kind of *paternal* concern: and such a student knowing that the *ne plus ultra* of improvement is yet to be discovered, naturally feels a reluctance at the thought of being taken from the objects of his attention, before they have received their complete display of usefulness and of beauty. And it cannot but be in some degree mortifying, that the fulness of discovery, like the entrance of the promised land to Moses, must be reserved for others, perhaps less laborious in the literary travel!

The advantage mainly to be proposed to ourselves, in the commencement and pursuit of learning, is, simply to desire to extract so much of its essence, as may be suited to the peculiar scope of our faculties and our present state; which to enjoy, and be content with, in the limitation of our mortal powers, is equally as rational as our being content with our sufficient share of meat and drink—the future abundance of which will be as much the natural right, as the temporary comfort of succeeding generations:—

And lastly; to cultivate a persuasion, that whatever can be valuable in the essence of wisdom, is capable of being more augmented when our state shall become changed from temporal imperfection into the unembarrassed and permanent privileges of eternity.


## Terms of the Balance,

FOR 1806.

To City Subscribers, Two Dollars and Fifty Cents, payable quarterly.

To those who receive them by Mail, Two Dollars, payable in Advance.

To those who take their papers at the Office, in bundles or otherwise, a deduction from the city price will be made.

A handsome Title Page and Table of Contents will accompany the last number of the Volume.

*NOTE.*

The first, second, third and fourth Volumes of Balance may be had on the following terms:...

| | |
|---|---|
| *First Volume*...unbound.. - | $ 2, |
| *Second Volume*, - - - - | $ 2, 50 |
| *Third Volume*, - - - - | $ 2, 50 |
| *Fourth Volume*, - - - - | $ 2, 50 |
| *The four together*, - - - - | $ 8 |

If bound, the price of binding (either plain or elegant) will be added---An unbound Volume may be sent to any Post-Office in the State for 52 Cents postage; or to any Post-Office in the Union for 78 Cents.

Advertisements inserted in a handsome and conspicuous manner, in the *Advertiser* which accompanies the Balance.

PUBLISHED BY

*HARRY CROSWELL,*

Warren-Street, Hudson,

*Where printing in general is executed with elegance and accuracy.*